

FEB 27 1956

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP70-00058R000100050066-3

Ag 3-1  
Pol 4  
x Pers 2-2

# The Washington Scene

## Mr. Dulles the Expounder

By WILLIAM H. STRINGER, Chief, Washington Bureau, The Christian Science Monitor

Washington — When Secretary of State John Foster Dulles sits down and ponders his weekend testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee one wonders if he will consider that the net contribution he made toward an informed and alert public opinion was all that the times responsibly require.

Let us seek to place in perspective his testimony—his defense of recent administration foreign policy.

The off-again, on-again shipment of 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia was a small tempest in an oil drum. More than one nation has held up policy for last-minute consideration. Even Moscow does this. There was nothing wrong in the sudden suspension except insofar as it epitomized the lack of coordination and absence of a sense of direction which recently has characterized administration foreign policy.

In Washington's streamlined executive branch, with such intermeshing machinery as the National Security Council, the Operations Coordination Board, and the Cabinet secretariat, it is surprising that officials were taken aback when 18 tanks suddenly appeared on the export conveyor belt.

Mr. Dulles also discussed damping down tensions in the Middle East. Available Washington information indicates that there is indeed, as the secretary hinted, a careful, hopeful effort going forward to effect a gradual solution to the Arab-Israeli feud. It involves many coordinated moves—strong hints to both the Arabs and the Israelis that no aggressor will profit; settlement of the anguishing Arab refugee problem, with Israel accepting some refugees and the rest relocated on lands irrigated by the Jordan Valley project and similar schemes; a gradual relaxation of tempers and no border incidents.

The State Department cannot possibly supply daily reports of how this delicate venture is faring. This is a time for diplomacy—macy—and surely for excluding the Middle East feud from

the election campaign, as Secretary Dulles urged.

The Dulles disservice came when he sought to assess current Soviet strategy and behavior. Before the Senate committee, as in his Life magazine article, there was the same overclaiming of American victories and the same residue of complacent impressions left on the public mind.

With the Soviet party congress and the Khrushchev

no changes in American policy are necessary or contemplated.

This is not at all how Western diplomats and, indeed, members of the State Department and high administration officials understand the situation. What is the picture?

There is indeed an atomic stalemate. And the passing of Stalin has unfrozen Soviet policy. The Soviets extracted all they could from their former bluster and threat. Now, having produced an atomic stalemate by ending the American H-bomb monopoly, they have chosen to launch out into direct economic penetrations of former forbidden realms in Asia, the Middle East, and even Africa. Bolder than Stalin in his later years, they are risking a return to "popular front" associations, and are making widespread offers of economic aid and trade.

In the very long-range picture Secretary Dulles could indeed argue that the concepts of Western freedom do have an irresistible attraction on all peoples, the Soviets included. And that therefore the West is helping to produce the "yeast of change" inside the Communist bloc.

But does the new direction in Soviet policy represent a victory for Washington? Is it not true that the current Soviet tactics, plus the advancing industrial prowess of the Soviet bloc, have confronted the United States and its allies with an exceedingly challenging and perilous problem? Is it not true that the drift to neutralism is increasing in Asia, that France is in trouble, the Middle East penetrated, and the Adenauer coalition in Western Germany being eroded?

Perhaps the administration is working out new answers to the Soviet challenge, based on our atoms-for-peace initiative, on long-range capital development programs for the neutral nations, and on measures to sustain an adequate military posture. One of these days President Eisenhower should give the public and Congress an administrative appraisal of the competitive coexistence struggle and what we are going to do about it.



Justus, Minneapolis Star

### Better Than Smoking Guns

speeches just concluded at Moscow, here was opportunity for a top American spokesman to present an impressive administration analysis of the Soviet challenge. Not the ideal forum—under hostile congressional interrogation—but an opportunity. And to a limited degree Mr. Dulles did elucidate, pointing out that the Kremlin rulers are dropping their 30-year policy of "intolerance" of other systems and conquest by violence, and doing a considerable rewriting of Stalinist dogma. He emphasized—as has his brother, Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency—the "yeast of change" at work inside the U.S.S.R.

But throughout the testimony was the claim and the inference that somehow the West had brought about this Kremlin change of direction, that it represented a real victory for the United States and a defeat for the Soviet Union, that the free world is in a stronger position than it was a year ago, and that

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT